# EXHIBIT "4"

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

LELAND TAYLOR AND	§	
KAREN TAYLOR,	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:08-CV-268-TJW
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	
	§	
NADEL AND GUSSMAN, LLC,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	JURY DEMANDED

## DEFENDANT NADEL AND GUSSMAN, LLC'S SECOND AMENDED ORIGINAL ANSWER

#### TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

COMES NOW, Nadel and Gussman, LLC, (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant") and files this, its Second Amended Original Answer in response to allegations contained in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint and states as follows:

### I. Parties

- 1. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 1 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 2. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 2 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 3. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 3 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

### II. <u>Jurisdiction</u>

4. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 4 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

#### III. <u>Venue</u>

- 5. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 5 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 6. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 6 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

### IV. Agency/Respondeat Superior

7. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 7 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

### V. <u>Facts</u>

- 8. Defendant admits that an oilfield accident occurred on or about August 29, 2007, in Rusk County, Texas, within the Eastern District of Texas wherein Plaintiff Leland Taylor was physically injured. Defendant denies all other allegations contained in Paragraph No. 8 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 9. Defendant admits that on or about August 29, 2007, Plaintiff Leland Taylor was working as a flow back hand on a natural gas well owned and operated by Defendant known as "Trawick 4-3." Defendant denies all other allegations contained in Paragraph No. 9 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

Case 2:08-cv-00268-TJW Document 62-5 Filed 08/10/09 Page 4 of 9 PageID #: 510

10. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Leland Taylor was present at the well to monitor the flow

back from the Trawick 4-3 after a plug in the well was drilled out by another company.

Defendant admits that after the drill-out of the plug in the Trawick 4-3 had been carried out,

Plaintiff Leland Taylor began monitoring the pressurized flow back of fluids from out of the

Trawick 4-3 and into a frac tank. Defendant denies all other allegations contained in Paragraph

No. 10 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

11. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 11 of Plaintiffs'

First Amended Complaint.

12. Defendant admits that as Plaintiff Leland Taylor was engaged in the activity of

monitoring the flow back coming from the Trawick 4-3, the pipe flow line assembly suddenly

began to rupture and break apart. Defendant admits that as this action occurred, a section of the

pipe flow line assembly at the area where Plaintiff Leland Taylor was monitoring the flow back

became detached from the assembly and struck Plaintiff Leland Taylor causing injuries to his

right leg and right arm. Defendant denies all other allegations contained in Paragraph No. 12 of

Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

13. Defendant admits the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 13 of Plaintiffs'

First Amended Complaint.

14. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Leland Taylor has been required to undergo various

surgeries and other medical procedures, tests, and examinations for the diagnosis and treatment

of his injuries. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Leland Taylor has incurred medical, hospital,

rehabilitation, and life care expenses. Defendant denies all other allegations contained in

Paragraph No. 14 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

- 15. Defendant is without sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 15. of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 16. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Leland Taylor has a limited ability to engage in certain physical activities and pursuits outside the employment context. Defendant denies all other allegations contained within Paragraph No. 16 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

# VI. Claim For Relief

- 17. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 17 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint. Defendant denies the allegations contained in all sub-parts of Paragraph No. 17 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 18. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 18 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 19. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 19 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.
- 20. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 20 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

# VII. Damages of Leland Taylor

21. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Leland Taylor was damaged in a sum in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limits of this court. Defendant denies all other allegations contained in Paragraph No. 21 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

# VIII. <u>Damages of Karen Taylor</u>

22. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph No. 22 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

# IX. Conclusion

23. Defendant admits that Plaintiff Leland Taylor was damaged in a sum in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limits of this court. Defendant denies that it was negligent or that its acts or omissions were the proximate cause of the incident made the basis of this suit.

## X. **Affirmative Defenses**

- 24. Defendant specifically pleads and would further show that Plaintiff Leland Taylor was contributorily negligent by failing to use ordinary care, caution, or prudence to avoid any claimed injuries and damages. Defendant would show that Leland Taylor engaged in negligent acts and/or omissions that when taken together or separately were the sole producing and/or sole proximate cause of Plaintiffs' claimed injuries and damages. Defendant requests the trier of fact to determine the percentage of responsibility of Leland Taylor pursuant to Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 33.003.
- 25. Defendant asserts that the acts and/or omissions of third-parties over whom Defendant had no control constitute the sole producing and/or sole proximate cause of Plaintiffs' claimed injuries and damages.
- 26. Defendant would show that David Boone Oilfield Consulting and Forrest Tate engaged in negligent acts and/or omissions that when taken together or separately were the sole producing and/or sole proximate cause of Plaintiffs' claimed injuries and damages. Defendant requests the trier of fact to determine the percentage of responsibility of David Boone Oilfield Consulting and Forrest Tate pursuant to Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 33.003.
- 27. Defendant affirmatively pleads that the claims of Leland Taylor as pled are barred by the exclusive remedy provision of the Texas Labor Code and Texas case law. Because Leland

Taylor was injured while engaged as an employee of Defendant, his negligence claims against Defendant, a subscriber of Texas Workman's Compensation Insurance, are barred in accordance with Texas Labor Code § 408.001.

28. Defendant affirmatively pleads that it is not liable for Plaintiffs' claimed injuries and damages under Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 95.003.

#### XI. Conclusion

29. WHEREFORE PREMISES CONSIDERED, Defendant Nadel and Gussman, LLC prays that Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint and each and every cause of action contained therein be dismissed, or in the alternative, for judgment over and against Plaintiff for cost of defending suit against this action and for such other and further relief to which Defendant may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMPSON, COE, COUSINS & IRONS

#### /S/ David A. McFarland

David A. McFarland (Attorney-in-Charge) State Bar No. 00791223

700 N. Pearl Street, 25<sup>th</sup> Floor Plaza of the Americas Dallas, Texas 75201-2832 Telephone: (214) 871-8292 Facsimile: (214) 871-8209

and

THE PARKER FIRM, P.C.

J. Chad Parker State Bar No. 00786153 W. Todd Parker State Bar No. 00794424 112 E. Li ne St., Ste. 202 Tyler, TX 75702 903/595-4541 Fax: 903/595-2864 Email: cparker@theparkerfirm.net

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT, NADEL AND GUSSMAN LLC

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per E. Dist. Tex. Loc. R. CV-5(a)(3) on August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2009. Any other counsel of record will be served via facsimile transmission.

Andy Tindel Provost Umphrey Law Firm - Tyler 112 E Line Suite 304 Tyler, TX 75702 903/596-0900 Fax: 903/596-0909

Email: atindel@andytindel.com

Lead Attorney Attorney To Be Noticed For Plaintiffs Leland Taylor And Karen Taylor

Laura D Schmidt Downs & Stanford 2001 Bryan St Suite 4000 Dallas, TX 75201-3005 214/748-7900

Fax: 12147484530

Email: lschmidt@downsstanford.com

Lead Attorney

Attorney To Be Noticed For Intervenor New Hampshire Insurance Company

/S/ David A. McFarland
David A. McFarland